Preserve

App. F. IX-4

1932. (Mayurai)

File No. 329-32

Serial Nos. 1-4.

Previous References

59-29-13

Mey 729-1883 12

307-22-1-4

11-1894-5

~~*Later References*~~

40 1894 5

326-21-1-7

33 1-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 4.

Part B for December 33.

SUBJECT.

Application of Mallari Gudda archaka of Hariharesvara Swamy temple for a modification of the Mayurai Sarpanivarakam's order of August 1893.

8/4.

Do Dist Mgr Court Mallari Gudda

No 860 of 21 12-33

Confirmation trial his appeal petition

is rejected.

Application of Mallappa Appeal 61
Sri Hanchu Veera Nagathavaru trustee
of the Muzrai Institutions

for the year 1932-33

General and Revenue Secretariat | Muz File No. of 193 2-3 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

1 Petition of 1.3.33 filed by Mr. B. Vasudeva Moorthy Advocate Bangalore City on behalf of his client Mallappa Gudoo Archaka of Sri Hanchaleswara temple Hanchal Chitaldrug District appealing against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner — No 114 of 32-33 of 22-11-32 on his request for separating the Archana and Abhisheka Services in the temple and designating the two Archakas Separately.

The petition is Sufficiently stamped and may be held as presented by him on the order appealed against is of 22/11/32.

Under Section 2nd of the Muz. Regn. the appeal is filed, & it is not known how far this is applicable to the case under reference Under Section 21 of the Muz. Regn the Suit is maintainable in the Court of the Dt Judge. Gross mismanagement of the Institution or of its property contemplated in Section 18 of the Regn or wrongful alienation etc of the properties referred to in Section 19 have not formed the subject matter of the appeal.

Kind reference is invited to the remarks portion of the annexure to G.O. No 391-3/Muz 729-18-2 of 31/7/19 from which it is seen that Mallappa Khasna Servant

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0216 —GPB—15,000—22-8-32

Revenue File No. of 1932-3 | General and Revenue Secretariat

in The P.W.D is an archak for consideration of the Inam land in his possession he is required to meet the Expenses of Abhisheka throughout the year for which no provision is found in the scale even sanctioned.

For orders if the appeal may be admitted & records called for —

G.S. Iyer
3/4/33

The order of the M.E. refd to in the pet is not an order passed in appellate but an order passed by the M.E. on the Dy reports on a petn presented by the petr to the M.E.

If the present petn is treated as an appeal it shd be an appeal against order No 331/A 21.5.96 refd to in the preamble to the impd order. It is seen from the same preamble that this order is one passed by the Mag Supdt in 1896 and affirmed ~~by~~ in G.O. A 31.7.19. No appeal lies against such an order. If at all a revn application shd have been presented within the period of limitation and this has not been done. The petn may be rejected.

x Encl to P.W.D II

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER
23 MAR 1933
No. 6184

The Mag Supdt 8/3/33
Order A 1896.

(For Secy)
Sr. Asst) is req. for ref. Mag 3.4 26/3.33 13

Serial No

Petition of 4.5.33 filed by Mr. B. Vasudeva Moorty Advocate for the appellant requesting under the circumstances set forth therein that the petitioner may kindly be given a hearing before orders are finally passed on his appeal.

9) Every possible effort was made to find out the Huz Supplemental order of 1896 referred to in the minute in para 8 supra. One Mr Kunhan applied for a copy of the same order as seen from the enclosed Memo. File & he has informed, after all efforts were made, that the copy applied for is not forthcoming & it is on this that the appellant is relying mostly. Enquiries were also made in Mr C's office if a copy of the said order could be had from & it is not available there also

10) In the course of investigation two (three) files viz 147 of 1895-96 & 400 of 1894-95 were came across: the former relates to the Cash Taxable of the temple & has nothing to do with the case: the latter relates to

x 2.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

4)

File No. of 193 . | General and Revenue Secretariat

An appeal petn of one Hariyabba of Harihar about his claim for the produce of Inam lands attached Abhishekha Service in the Temple -

11) On making further enquiries Para 11 of 1894-95 is found + forms the basis for the order No. 884 / Mercy J. 11-94 of 29/8/1895 wherein one Neelakantabba is recognised as the Eldest male member of Sri Harihareswara Swamy temple for Hariyabba, the Archaka ... omitting the Talari Grant son having been reserved for the Canon -

12) The available records are Mysore & Secd. Cutcherry records &

13) The M.C. may be asked to send a copy of the Mercy Exp. order of 1896 required by the Member.

JE Secy)

There has been unnecessary delay in the disposal of this case. The C.S.O. is warned to be careful in future.

1818

This has been pending for over 5 months. The Govt. should be informed accordingly.

Yes.

Draft revised & typed.

(5

Application of Mallan Gurusamy Chetty for a modification of the Muzrai Superintendent's order of 1896.

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 193 . [App F. III—2

Serial No.	
1	No 245 of 23-8-33 to the Muzrai Commissioner Calling for a Copy of Muzrai Superintendents order no 331 of 21-8-1896 returned to him
	Letter no 341/33-34 of 26/10/33 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding copy of the Muzrai Superintendent's order no 331 of 21-8-1896 received with letter no A5-4B3 381-33 of 16-10-33 from the Deputy Commissioner Chitaldrug District.
3	1st Copy furnished does not bear the number 331, though it bears the same date as the one quoted in the P.W.D T—
	If the orders issued by the Muzrai Superintendent are clear: he has directed that in future the two persons working in Sri Hariharesvara Swamis temple shall both be styled archakas in baraboards and pay of Rs 2/- each to work in rotation in alternate years & that they shall not be entered in baraboard one as an archaka & the other as abhishaki—
	b) Letter with reference to para 8 of 13th Aug—

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

GW 24/11

W.D. 70—SDPM—60,000—13-S 31

3/12

Appeal Petn of Mahant Das
Archaka for grass Hanumakondan
Hanumakonda

File No. Land/R 329 of 193 3.. 4 General and Revenue Secretaria

2) Repn:— Members minute at para 8 supra — A copy of the orders of 1896, called for the M.C. is submitted for kind perusal (Flag A). It is clear & crystal therein that the abbrakeli & archak shall hereinafter be styled Achako & given Rs 2/- each, and allowed to work for a year each. As such the appellant has no case.

) Kind repn is also limited to paras 5 & 6 of the orders. The petition may perhaps be rejected.

1/12/33

2nd Secy)

2nd Secy)

23) 4/12

I agree

5/12

5/12

11/12

Office Note

Gen 16/12

15/12/33

Endorsement No 860 dt 21-12-1933 to
the Mahant Guru. in writing that it is
granted

C. o of the Second Member of Council. No. 3 3 34

Serial No.

Memo no 861 dy 21.12.33 to the Municipal Commissioner forwarding copy of the above Memos. for information.

No 862 dy 21.12.33 from K Vasudeva Moorthi advocate for the petitioner forwarding copy of the Government orders

Client Mr. Malkani Gentleman

29.12

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31

File No. of 193 .

General and Revenue Secretariat



BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHA-

RAJA OF MYSORE, -BANGALORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. of 1932-33.

Malhari Guddi, Archek, Sri Harihareswara Temple, Harihar, Chitaldrug Dist. .. Appellant.

-Vs-

Malhari Bhatta son of Hariyappa adopted to Thirakambhatta, Archak, Abhisheki, Sri Harihare-swara Temple, Harihar. .. Respondent.

UNDER SECTION 21 OF THE MUZRAI REGULATION.

The appellant begs to appeal against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner dated 22nd November 1932 in Dis. No. 114 of 1932-33 copy of which is annexed, on the following among other grounds.

1. The learned Muzrai Commissioner erred in not giving an opportunity to the appellant to be heard before rejecting his application.

2. In the temple of Sri Harihareswara at Harihar there have been both an Archak and an

Abhisheki

9

Abhiseki all along. The appellant's grandfather one Hariappa was the barawardar R - Archak of the said Harihareswara Temple and the father of the present Abhisheki, the - respondent above named was the Abhisheki of the same. Hariappa was getting cash remuneration of Rs. 12/- per annum xfor his servides as Archak and the Abhisheki was getting a cash grant of Rs. 4-8-0 per annum and in addition x was given the enjoyment of certain service - Inamti lands in the villages of Amracti and Belludi, Survey Nos. 62 and 36 acres 38 assessed at Rs. 13/- with an income of Rs. 50/- and survey No. 36 acres 16-30 assessed at Rs. 13/- with an income of Rs. 110/- respectively, - yielding in all about Rs.160/- annually.

3. The barawardar Hariappa had during his life time got appointed one Nilakanta - Bhatta (not the opponent's father) as his - gumasta owing to his own serious illness. A few years after the appointment of the gumasta Nelakantappa, the gumastha Neelakantappa and the then Abhisheki, that is, the respondent's father, started disputes among themselves about their duties, in particular, the carrying of water and took up the matter to the then - Inzrai Superintendent who has decided that the duties of Archakship and the Abhisheki

should

should be performed by these two persons in rotation in alternative years vide Muz: Superintendent's order No. 331 dated 21-8-1896. This order appears to have been purely a tentative and ad-interim arrangement for the purpose of ensuring the carrying on the work during the time of the gumastha of the appellant's grand-father only. This order was passed without the knowledge or consent of the Hakdar Archak Hariappa. Then no orders seem to have been passed by the Muzrai Superintendent regarding either extra remuneration or enjoyment of the service Inam lands to be given to the Archak for performing the extra duties of Archak in addition to his own work during his year of office. But only when the archak actually performed the Abhisheki's duties the abhisheki was directed to contribute Rs.12/- in 1926 for the actual expenses of "Parimala-bhisheka" during that year. This contribution was in no sense any remunerationto the Archak but puly one given to the temple.

4. The Abhisheki therefore enjoys the service Inam lands with a salary of Rs. 24/- during the year when he does not perform any duties. During the year when the Archak performs both the duties he (archak) gets nothing beyond his Rs.24/- per annum, his (archak's) salary since 1896. The same is obviously unfair to the petitioner and can

in no

in no way be justified.

5. The above arrangement and order of the Muzrai Superintendent has at no time been ratified by the Government.

6. Latterly when the petitioner as heir of the Baravardar Archak took charge of the office from the heir of the Gumasta Archak in presuance of the Government order appointing the petitioner in Muz: appeal No. 2 of 1929 - 1930 in 1930 he found this arrangement and has therefore preferred this application.

7. In conclusion the petitioner humbly prays that his Hakdari Archakaship and the Hakdari of Abhishekiship of Mallarabhatta might be kept separate and each asked to perform his respective duties , Archaka performing the services of Puja and Utsava and the Abhisheki performing the duties of fetching water and other duties connected with Abhisheka as it was during his grand-father's time. As a dispute arose between the two temporary Gumasta Archaks namely Neelakantappa and Ramachandrappa about fetching water from the river for Abhisheka, the then Muzrai Commissioner ordered that both the duties of Archaka and Abhisheki in rotation in alternate years. This temporary arrangement was made only to settle the dispute of those two Gumasta Archaks and in no way affects the petitioner's separate duty of Archakaship as he has been appointed as Archak in place of his grand-father Hariyappa.

8. The appellant therefore prays orders may

may be passed specifying the seperate duties of Archak and Abhisheki and ordering petitioner to continue as an undisturbed arChak as his grandfather was, since the opponent Mallarbhatta enjoys the Inam lands for his Abhisheki services.

Bangalore,

Date, 1 - 3 — 1933.

Petitioner.



Order of the Mussai Commissioner in Mysore: —

Reference: —

(1) Order No. 331 dated 21st August 1896 issued to the Amildar of the Harihar Sub-taluk directing among other ~~things~~ matters that the two Varawardars working alternately archane and abhisheka services in the Sri Harihareswaraswami temple at Harihar should both be designated as Archaks and each should render archane service in the Dodda Harihareswara Samidhi in turns of one year.

(2) Petition dated 10.8.32 from Mahadevi Guddo, archak of the Sri Harihareswaraswami temple praying the two services mentioned above may be separated and the Varawardars differently designated.

(3) Letter No. A 5, 354/32-33 dated 22nd October 1932 from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District, stating that the arrangement ordered by the Mussai Superintendent in 1896 and affirmed in G.O. No. 391-3 Mus 729-18-2 dated 31st July 1919 may continue, as any change in the present arrangement may create trouble

Order D, Dis No. 1114/32-33
Dated 22-11-32

Recorded. -

14

Sd/ S Hinamaya
Mussai Commissioner

Copy applied for by M. B Varadha Murty
on 7-1-33

Copy ready on 10-1-33
delivered on 16-1-33

No. of words 142
Copying fees 0-4-0
Comparing-do 0-0-8
Paper 0-0-1
Total 0-4-9



Copied by S. Jayaramaiah
Compared by A Venkataramaiah

"Copy"
Agent Varadhamurthi
Manager,
Mus: Comm's Office



In the Court of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

Misc: appeal CASE No. OF 1932 —1933.

Appellant, Plaintiff.	*Respondent, Defendant.*
Malhari Guddu.	Malhari Bhatta.

VS.

1. I the appellant abovenamed do by these presents retain MR. B. VASUDEVAMURTHY, B.A., LL.B, *Advocate*, to appear in and conduct the above case on my behalf to judgment.

2. I further empower him to execute any decree or order that may be passed in my behalf and to receive from Court all documents, refunds and sums of money as I may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefor.

3. I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the legal acts done by him in so doing.

BANGALORE,
11-2-1933 193

Accepted.

Signed before me and personally known to me.

Advocate for Appellant.

Advocate.

KARNATAKA PRESS, B.-CITY.

16

Before The Court of His
Highness the Maharaja
Mysore Bangalore

Miscl appeal No 32-33

Mallan Gudda appellant
is
Mallan Bhatta Respt

Mr m 1-2-1933

Mr BV asudeva mallya Bar at law
for appellant



Pet. Stamped with Rs2 Stamps 4/5/33

Presented by Mr. Gnana Rao brother-in-law of the appellant. 4/5/33

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, - BANGALORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. of 1932-33.

Malhari Guddu, Archek Sri Harihareswara Temple Harihar, Chitaldrug Dist: .. Appellant.

-Vs-

Malhari Bhatta son of Hariyappa adopted to Thirakambhatta, Archak Abhisheki, Sri Harihareswara Temple, Harihar. .. Respondent.

The appellant begs to state as follows:-

1. The appellant has preferred an appeal in the above case on and prays that the following may be read as additional grounds thereof.

2. Even during the life time and active service of the Barawardar Archak Hariyappa there seem to have been disputes between the said Hakdar Archak and the Hakdari Abhisheki i.e., the respondents regarding their various duties. These disputes went on from 1883 and in 1887 (on or about 18-8-1987, the then Deputy commissioner of Chitaldrug

Chiltadrug passed orders declaring their respective duties. The then - Abhisheki went in appeal to Government and the then Dewan passed orders No. 1935 of 20/28th - November 1887 confirming the duties of the Abhisheki.

3. As stated above in para 3 of the original appeal memo the tentative order of the Muarai Commissioner directing the carrying out of the duties by rotation was passed on a dispu between the Gumasthas of the Hakdars only. The latter were not consulted though they were alive nor were their rights safeguarded and the Muzrai Commissioner's order if it purported to alter - the previous Government Order must be deemed to be either purely a temporary measure and administrative for the period of gumasthaship only or other wise completely ultravires and cannot in any way be deemed as superseding the Government order aforesaid so as to bind the Hakdars.

4. The appellant was when the said Muzrai Commissioner's order was passed a minor and really came into office about 2 years ago as per very recent orders of Government and after - fulfilling all the conditions and rigorous tests laid down by the said Government order.

5. The appellant further prays that he may be heard through Counsel early before orders are passed on this appeal.

Bangalore,
Dated 4-5-1933.

For Appellant.

No 245

My 329 - 32 - 2

From

The Secy to

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Financial Department, Bangalore.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

23rd August 1933.xxx

In connection with the appeal preferred to Government by Malhari Gudda, Archak of Sri Hariharesvaraswami Temple at Harihar, Chitaldrug District, against your order No.D.Dis. 114/32-33 dated 22nd November 1932 recording Chitaldrug Deputy Commissioner's letter dated 22nd October 1932 in the matter of continuing the archna and Abhisheka services already ordered, I am directed to request you to send for reference copy of order No.331 dated 21st August 1896 issued to the Deputy Amildar of Harihar Sub Talak which has been referred to in the preamble of your order dated 12th November 1932 mentioned above.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

K.M.R.2/23-8.

20

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

2 Copies.

Section 17(3)
File No. 354 - 32
Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to .....9354..... . No. 245

To

The M.C.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 23/8/33

Signed by Mr B. Muddukrishnappa

Sir,

In Connection with the appeal preferred before by Malhari Budda, Archak of Sri Harihareswara Swami temple at Harihar, Chitaldrug Dt., against your order No. D. Dis. 114/32-33 dt 22-11-32 recording the Chitaldrug D.C's letter dt 22-10-32 in the matter of Continuing Archana Abhisheke Services at the said temple, I am directed to request you to send a copy of the order No. 331 dt 21-8-1896 issued to the Amildar of Harihar Sub Taluk which has been referred to in the preamble of your office order dt 12-11-32 above.

I am directed to request you to be so good as to send for record copy of order no 331 of 21.8.1896 issued to the Amildar of the Harihar Sub Tk which has been referred to in the very outset of the preamble portion of your office order no D. Dis 114/32-33 of 22/11/32 recording the Chitaldrug D.C's letter no A 5354/32-33 of 22/10/32 reporting that an application

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 673—GPB—15,000—26-8-32

21

re: Ceremonial & Abhishek Services [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] in force may continue as they
Change in the present arrangement
may create trouble
Thank You

Yr Sincerely

GS
22/8

No. 341/33-11
Eve Acc

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE 22

Bangalore, 26. 193

FROM

~~S. HIRIANNAIYA, Esq., M.A., B.L.,~~

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,

Mug 329-32-3.

Revenue Department

SIR,

As desired in your letter No.215 Un. dated 20-9-33, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Muzrai Superintendent's order No.351 dated 21-9-1933 received with letter No.A5-I.Dis.381-33 dated 10-10-33 from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Muzrai Commissioner.

మిగిలిన వారందరూ సంస్థాన మధ్యలో ఉన్న పెద్ద
చింత చెట్టు దగ్గరకు వెళ్ళి ఉన్నారు -

ఇలా ఉండగా మహాత్ములకు మొదట్నుంచీ ఉన్న
వైరాగ్య చింతన స్థానమందు ప్రారంభమై ఈ లోకమంతా
మాయయని, దేహాభిమానం ఉన్నవారు జన్మ మరణాలు
పొందుతారని, తుదకు మోక్ష ప్రాప్తి పొందాలంటే
ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయాలని, ఆత్మ విచారణ అంటే
ఏమిటి? నేను ఎవరిని? ఎక్కడి నుండి వచ్చాను?
నేను ఎవరిని? ఎక్కడి నుండి వచ్చాను? అని
తనలో తాను ప్రశ్నించుకోవడమే ఆత్మ విచారణ
అని, ఈ ప్రశ్నలకు సమాధానం తెలుసుకోవడమే
ఆత్మ విచారణ అని, ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయడం
ఎలా? అని ఆలోచిస్తూ ఉన్నారు. ఆ సమయంలో
ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయడం ఎలా? అని ప్రశ్నించిన
వారందరికీ ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయడం ఎలాగో
చెప్పాలి -

ఈ లోపల అందరూ మహాత్ములు ఉన్న
చోటుకు వచ్చి, ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయడం ఎలా?
అని ప్రశ్నించిన వారందరికీ ఆత్మ విచారణ
చేయడం ఎలాగో చెప్పారు. ఆ తరువాత
మహాత్ములు ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయడం ఎలా?
అని ప్రశ్నించిన వారందరికీ ఆత్మ విచారణ
చేయడం ఎలాగో చెప్పారు. ఆ తరువాత
మహాత్ములు ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయడం ఎలా?
అని ప్రశ్నించిన వారందరికీ ఆత్మ విచారణ
చేయడం ఎలాగో చెప్పారు. ఆ తరువాత
మహాత్ములు ఆత్మ విచారణ చేయడం ఎలా?
అని ప్రశ్నించిన వారందరికీ ఆత్మ విచారణ
చేయడం ఎలాగో చెప్పారు. ఆ తరువాత

ఫిర్యాదిదారుడు అడిగిన ప్రశ్నలకు సమాధానాలు
ఇవ్వడానికి ఎవరు అధికారులో, ఎప్పుడు, 12 దినములలోగా
ఫిర్యాదిదారుడు అడిగిన ప్రశ్నలకు సమాధానాలు
ఇవ్వడానికి ఎవరు అధికారులో వారి పేర్లు
వివరాలు ఫిర్యాదిదారుడు అడిగిన ప్రశ్నలకు
సమాధానాలు ఇవ్వడానికి ఎవరు అధికారులో
వారి పేర్లు వివరాలు ఫిర్యాదిదారుడు
అడిగిన ప్రశ్నలకు సమాధానాలు ఇవ్వడానికి
ఎవరు అధికారులో వారి పేర్లు వివరాలు

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

(25

No. Ft. 860

Bangalore, Dated, 13th Decr. 192 1933

Mly 329-32-4

ENDORSEMENT.

To

Mr. Malheri Guddu, Archak, Sri Mariheresware Temple,

Marihar, Hiteldrug District.

With reference to his petitions dated the 1st Nov and 4th May 1933, appealing against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore in the matter of the archana and the abhisheka services in Sri Mariheresvareswami Temple at Marihar ~~being~~ being seperated and the berr ards differently designated. Mr. Malhari Guddu is informed that his petition is rejected.

Sd. S. Shamanna,
Financial Secretary to Govt.

4.

Memo.No. 861 Mly 821-12-33

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, for information with reference to his letter No.341/33-34 dated the 26th Oct. 1933.

BY ORDER,
Sd. S. Shamanna.
Financial Secretary to Govt.

861 Mly 821 in 12-33

Copy to Mr. P.Vasudevamoorty, B.A.LL.B., Advocate for the petitioner.

BY ORDER,
K N Krishnamoorthy
Financial Secretary.

Appendix F G—1]

26

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section

File No. 329 - 32

Serial No. 47

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 860

To

Mr. Malhari Gudoo.
Archak -
Sri Harihareswara Temple
Harihar. Chitaldrug
Dt.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 21/12/33

Signed by Mr K.N. Krishnaswami

Ayr

Ir. Th. xpte to his per[ns] dy 1.3.33 and ~~the subsequent per[n]~~ dy 4.5.33. appealing against the order dy. ~~the~~ M.C. in the matter of the Archana and the Abhisheka Seviss in Sri Harihareswara - Swami Temple at Harihar being separated & the hereditary differently assigned

List of enclosures .....

Mr Malhari Gudoo is informed ~~for the information~~ - that ~~the~~ he is entitled to ~~interfere with the orders of the M.C. and this appeal~~ but his plea is rejected.

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

DS. D

18/12/33 for Ayr

WD 0677—GPB—15,000—3-11-33

862/Mag [illegible] 21.12.33

Copy with B. Vasudeva Moorthy Esq Advocate for the petr.

B-O

Date 18/12/33

for HLSCO

861/Mag [illegible] 21-12-33

G.V 18/12

w.n.c. for information

Writ Petition No 341/33-34

of 28/10/33

B-O

Date 18/12/33

for HRCE

27 pages